# Case 2:11-cv-07653-PBT Document 1 Filed 12/14/11 Page 1 of 12

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

# **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	MOTROCHORS ON THE REV	ERGE OF THE FORM.)		DEFEND ANGE			
GOLDIE DAKIN				DEFENDANTS			
GOLDIE DAKIN				NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.			
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff				County of Residence	of First Listed	d Defendant	
(c) Attorney's (Firm N	ame, Address, Telephone N	umber and Email Add	ress)	NOTE: IN LAN	ID CONDEMN	ATION CASES 11	SE THE LOCATION OF THE
Craig Thor Kimmel, E					INVOLVED.		SE THE ECONTROL OF THE
Kimmel & Silverman, P.C. 30 E. Butler Pike				Attorneys (If Known)			
Ambler, PA 19002							
(215) 540-8888			6				
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X"	in One Box Only)	III. C	TIZENSHIP OF P (For Diversity Cases Only)	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	Not a Party)		P	TF DEF	Incorporated or Pr	and One Box for Defendant)  PTF DEF rincipal Place
☐ 2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity		Citize	en of Another State	2 🗇 2	Incorporated and I	Principal Place
Defendant	(Indicate Citizensh	ip of Parties in Item III)				of Business In A	
				en or Subject of a  reign Country	3 🗇 3	Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI			nakolina firebilina ara				
☐ 110 Insurance	TOI PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJURY		ORFEITURE/PENALTY  O Agriculture		KRUPTCY al 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act	☐ 310 Airplane	362 Personal Injury -	□ 62	0 Other Food & Drug	1 423 Withd	rawal	☐ 400 State Reapportionment ☐ 410 Antitrust
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	315 Airplane Product Liability	Med. Malpractice  ☐ 365 Personal Injury -		5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	28 US	C 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking ☐ 450 Commerce
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment		Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal		0 Liquor Laws 0 R.R. & Truck	PROPER  820 Copyr	TY RIGHTS	460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	330 Federal Employers' Liability	Injury Product Liability	□ 65	0 Airline Regs. 0 Occupational	☐ 830 Patent		Corrupt Organizations
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine	PERSONAL PROPERT	Υ	Safety/Health	☐ 840 Trade	nark	<ul><li>■ 480 Consumer Credit</li><li>□ 490 Cable/Sat TV</li></ul>
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability	☐ 370 Other Fraud☐ 371 Truth in Lending	0.00	0 Other LABOR	SOCIALS	SECURITY	810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/
of Veteran's Benefits ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle	380 Other Personal Property Damage	0 71	0 Fair Labor Standards Act	☐ 861 HIA ( ☐ 862 Black		Exchange  875 Customer Challenge
☐ 190 Other Contract ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability	Product Liability  360 Other Personal	385 Property Damage Product Liability		D Labor/Mgmt. Relations D Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	☐ 863 DIWC	/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC 3410
☐ 196 Franchise  REAL PROPERTY	Injury CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIONS		& Disclosure Act	□ 865 RSI (4	05(g))	☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 441 Voting	510 Motions to Vacate	T 790	Railway Labor Act Other Labor Litigation	■ FEDERA □ 870 Taxes	LTAX SUITS (U.S. Plaintiff	892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters
☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 442 Employment ☐ 443 Housing/	Sentence Habeas Corpus:	79	Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	or Def	endant) Third Party	☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 895 Freedom of Information
☐ 240 Torts to Land ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	Accommodations  444 Welfare	☐ 530 General ☐ 535 Death Penalty	77.56.48.5	IMMIGRATION	26 US		Act
290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	540 Mandamus & Othe		Naturalization Application			900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access
	446 Amer. w/Disabilities -	☐ 550 Civil Rights ☐ 555 Prison Condition		Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee			to Justice  950 Constitutionality of
	Other  440 Other Civil Rights		O 465	Other Immigration Actions			State Statutes
<b>□</b> 2 Re		Remanded from   Appellate Court	4 Reins Reope	another	uistrict	☐ 6 Multidistri Litigation	- Magistrate
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	``XXI			Oo not cite jurisdictional		•	Judgment
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of car Fair Debt Collect	use: ction Practices Act					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		S A CLASS ACTION		MAND \$		ECK YES only in	f demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASI	E(S) (See instructions):			Λ	*** **********************************		
Explanation:	(See instructions).	JUDGE	····		DOCKET	NUMBER	
DATE 12-14-11		SIGNATURE OF A	ATTÓR	NEY OF RECORD	***************************************	T V T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	

# Case 2:11-cv-07653-PBT Document 1 Filed 12/14/11 Page 2 of 12

Address of Plaintiff: 157 Heather Brooke Estates, Muncy,	PA 17756
Address of Plaintiff: 157 Heather Brooke Estates, Muncy, Address of Defendant: 507 Productial Road, Harsha	m, PA 19044
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:	
(Use Reverse Side Fo	• •
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation	n and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1	(a))   Yes
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes No P
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one	year previously terminated action in this court?
	Yes□ No □
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prio action in this court?	r suit pending or within one year previously terminated
	Yes No No
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlie	
terminated action in this court?	Yes No P
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rig	hts case filed by the same individual?
	Yes No No
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
<ol> <li>□ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts</li> <li>□ FELA</li> </ol>	1. ☐ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	2.  Airplane Personal Injury
4. □ Antitrust	<ul><li>3. □ Assault, Defamation</li><li>4. □ Marine Personal Injury</li></ul>
5. □ Patent	5. ☐ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	ž į
	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7. □ Civil Rights	7. Products Liability
8. □ Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos
9. ☐ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
11. All other Federal Question Cases 15 U.S. C. \$1692	(======================================
(Please specify)	WW.C. A. W.O.V.
ARBITRATION CERT  (Check Appropriate Counsel of record do hereby certification)  (Counsel of record do hereby certification)	lategory)
, control of topogra do notoby contr	fy:
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
□ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	
DATE: 12-14-11	57100
Attorney-at-Law /	Attorney I.D.#
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if the	ere has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or except as noted above.	within one year previously terminated action in this court
DATE: 12-14-11	57100
Attorney-at-Law <sup>v</sup> CIV. 609 (6/08)	Attorney I.D.#

# Case 2:11-cv-07653-PBT Document 1 Filed 12/14/11 Page 3 of 12

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

## **CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM**

Goldie Dal	in	: CIVIL ACTION					
NCO Financial	Systems, Inc.	: : : NO.					
plaintiff shall complete filing the complaint and side of this form.) In designation, that defend the plaintiff and all oth to which that defendan	a Case Management Tral serve a copy on all defer the event that a defend dant shall, with its first a er parties, a Case Manage t believes the case shoul		ime of everse g said rve on				
SELECT ONE OF TH	IE FOLLOWING CAS	E MANAGEMENT TRACKS:					
(a) Habeas Corpus – C	a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.						
(b) Social Security – C and Human Service	ases requesting review or es denying plaintiff Socia	of a decision of the Secretary of Health al Security Benefits.	( )				
(c) Arbitration – Cases	required to be designate	ed for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	$\langle \times \rangle$				
(d) Asbestos – Cases ir exposure to asbesto		onal injury or property damage from	( )				
commonly referred	to as complex and that i	Il into tracks (a) through (d) that are need special or intense management by a detailed explanation of special					
management cases.		r	( )				
(f) Standard Managem	ent – Cases that do not f	fall into any one of the other tracks.	( )				
17-14-1   Date	Craig hor Attorney-at-l	Kimmel Goldie Dakin Attorney for					
215-540-8888	877-788-28	164 Kimmel@credithau	s. (om				
Telephone	FAX Numbe	r E-Mail Address					

(Civ. 660) 10/02

### 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 GOLDIE DAKIN, 4 Plaintiff 5 Case No.: 6 v. 7 NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR **JURY TRIAL** 8 Defendant (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 9 10 **COMPLAINT** 11 GOLDIE DAKIN ("Plaintiff"), by and through her attorneys, KIMMEL & 12 SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. 13 ("Defendant"): 14 INTRODUCTION 15 Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 1. 16 U.S.C. §1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"). 17 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE** 18 19 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states 20 that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court 21 without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original 22 jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States. 23 3. Defendant has its corporate headquarters in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 24 and as such, personal jurisdiction is established. 25 Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(1). 4.

#### **PARTIES**

- 5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Muncy, Pennsylvania.
- 6. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 7. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, PA 19044.
- 8. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 9. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 10. At all pertinent times hereto, Defendant was hired to collect a consumer debt and attempted to collect that debt from Plaintiff.
- 11. The debt arose out of transactions that were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 12. Beginning in or around December 2010, and continuing through November 2011, Defendant and others it retained constantly and continuously placed harassing and abusive collection calls to Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment of an alleged consumer debt.
- 13. Many of Defendant's calls to Plaintiff originated from: 800-597-4549, which the undersigned has confirmed is a telephone number belonging to Defendant.
- 14. Defendant contacted Plaintiff on her home telephone, on average, four (4) to five(5) times a day between December 2010 and November 2011.
- 15. In one of her first communications with Defendant in December 2010, Plaintiff demanded that Defendant stop calling her about the alleged debt.

- 16. Defendant, however, ignored Plaintiff's instructions to stop contacting her, and instead, continued to call her almost everyday, sometimes calling her as frequently as five (5) times in a single day, for nearly a year.
- 17. Most recently, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on October 31, 2011; November 1, 2011; November 2, 2011; November 3, 2011; November 4, 2011; November 5, 2011; November 7, 2011; and November 8, 2011.
- 18. Additionally, in one of her initial conversations with Defendant, Plaintiff informed Defendant that she was on a fixed income and unable to pay the amount that it was demanding.
- 19. Using a rude and condescending tone, Defendant told Plaintiff "yes, you can [pay the debt] if you wanted to."
- 20. On at least one occasion, in response to Defendant's harassing communications on the telephone, Plaintiff hung up the telephone on Defendant, and Defendant immediately called Plaintiff back, further harassing her.
- 21. Plaintiff's only way to deal with the Defendant's constant and repetitive calls was to not answer the phone.
- 22. However, this did not provide any relief, as Defendant not only called, but also left numerous voicemails for Plaintiff each day.
- 23. As a result, Plaintiff was inundated with as many as five (5) phone calls and five (5) voicemail messages a day from Defendant.
- 24. Upon information and belief, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on a repetitive basis with the intent to harass Plaintiff into paying an alleged debt.
  - 25. The repetitive calls to Plaintiff were intended by Defendant to be disturbing,

harassing, and an invasion of privacy.

- 26. Desiring to put a stop to Defendant's continuous and repeated telephone calls, Plaintiff retained counsel to assist her with stopping the harassment.
- 27. On November 9, 2011, counsel for Plaintiff sent correspondence to Defendant advising that Plaintiff was represented by counsel and that it was to cease and desist contacting Plaintiff. See Exhibit A, November 9, 2011, letter to Defendant.
- 28. Despite knowing that Plaintiff was represented by counsel and that Plaintiff did not want to be contacted on the phone about the alleged debt, on November 17, 2011, and November 23, 2011, Defendant contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 29. Defendant's actions in attempting to collect the alleged debt were harassing, abusive and highly deceptive.

## **CONSTRUCTION OF LAW**

- 30. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.</u>, 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); <u>see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp.</u>, 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); <u>Clomon v. Jackson</u>, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 31. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be

construed liberally in favor of the consumer." <u>Johnson v. Riddle</u>, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).

32. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3<sup>rd</sup> Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

# COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 33. In its actions to collect a debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
  - a. Defendant violated the FDCPA generally;
  - b. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(1) of the FDCPA when it communicated with Plaintiff at a time or place that or knew or should have known was inconvenient;
  - c. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(2) of the FDCPA when it communicated with Plaintiff after it knew that Plaintiff was represented by an attorney;

- d. Defendant violated §1692c(c) of the FDCPA when it continued to communicate with Plaintiff after it received a written demand that it stop;
- e. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA when it harassed, oppressed or abused Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt;
- f. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA when it caused Plaintiff's phone to ring, and engaged Plaintiff in conversation repeatedly or continuously with the intent to annoy, abuse, or harass Plaintiff; and
- g. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA when it used unfair and unconscionable means in connection with the collection of a debt.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, GOLDIE DAKIN, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

## **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, GOLDIE DAKIN, demands a jury trial in this

case.

# Case 2:11-cv-07653-PBT Document 1 Filed 12/14/11 Page 10 of 12

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED, 1 2 Date: 12-14-11 3 By: Craig Thor Kimmel 4 Attorney ID No. 57100 Tara L. Patterson 5 Attorney ID No. 88343 Kimmel & Silverman, P.C. 6 30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 7 Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (877) 788-2864 8 kimmel@creditlaw.com Email: 9 tpatterson@creditlaw.com Email: 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

25

CRAIG THOR KIMMEL\* ROBERT M. SILVERMAN\*\*

- Member, PA Bar
- Member, NJ Bar
- \* Member, DE Bar Member, NY Bar
- ^Member, MA Bar Member, MD Bar
- Member, OH Bar
- § Member, MI Bar
- Member, NH Bar
- Member, CT Bar

- \* Mambar WY Bar Member, DC Bar
- 4 Member, CA Bar



www.CREDITLAW.com (800)-NOT-FAIR

CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS 30 E. Butler Pike, Ambler, PA 19002 Toll Free (800)-668-3247 Fax (877)-788-2864

DELAWARE, 501 Silverside Road, Suite 118, Wilmington, DE 19809, (302) 791-9373 NEW ENGLAND, 60 Hartford Pike, P.O. Box 325, Dayville, CT 06241, (860) 866-4380 NEW JERSEY, Executive Quarters, 1930 E. Marlton Pike, Suite Q29, Cherry Hill, NJ 08003, (856) 429-8334 NEW YORK, 1001 Avenue of the Americas, 12th Floor, New York, NY 10018, (212) 719-7543 WESTERN DISTRICT OF NY, 1207 Delaware Avenue, Suite 440, Buffalo, NY 14209, (716) 332-6112 W. PENNSYLVANIA, 210 Grant Street, Suite 202, Pittsburgh, PA 15219, (412) 566-1001 Please reply to CORPORATE HEADQUARTERS

November 9, 2011

#### VIA E-MAIL

Ross S. Enders, Esq. Sessions, Fishman, Nathan & Israel, LLC 200 Route 31 North, Suite 203 Flemington, NJ 08822

RE: Dakin, Goldie v. NCO Financial Systems, Inc.

Dear Mr. Enders:

Please be advised that we represent the above-named individual regarding claims against your company pursuant to the Federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C 1692, et seq. and State law. Having been formally notified of representation, we respectfully demand you not contact our client for any reason. Instead, please direct all future contact and correspondence to our attention only. We reserve the right to seek injunctive relief should you fail to honor these directives.

THIS LETTER ALSO SERVES AS NOTICE TO IMMEDIATELY CEASE AND DESIST CONTACTING OUR CLIENT with respect to the collection or attempted collection of any debt, pursuant to the federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692b(6) and 1692c(b), et seq. There to be absolutely no calls, letters, or other communications whatsoever by any debt collector. Do not contact our client at home, at work, by cellular phone, by mail or otherwise.

Based upon the information received to date, an FDCPA claim is being prepared and will be filed against your company without further advance notice. You may if desired, contact us to discuss the matter but in any event, do not attempt to communicate with our client directly.



JACQUELINE C. HERRITT" ROBERT A. RAPKIN'
ANGELA K. TROCCOLI\*\*

CHRISTINA GILL ROSEMAN\*\*

W. CHRISTOPHER COMPONOVO\*
TIMOTHY J. ABEEL, JR.\*
JACOB U. GINSBURG\*
JOSEPH L. GENTILCORE\*

AMY L. BENNECOFF" \*\*\* PF

RICHARD A. SCHOLER\*

TARA I. PATTERSON

FRED DAVIS\*

# Case 2:11-cv-07653-PBT Document 1 Filed 12/14/11 Page 12 of 12

Sincerely,

/s/ Craig Thor Kimmel

CRAIG THOR KIMMEL